

REMARKS

1. Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) indicating portions of the text of the specification that are not present in the drawing. A replacement drawing sheet is attached that includes the text recited from the specification by the Examiner, except for the features recited as "optional", which have not been added to the drawing. No new matter has been added.

2. Objections to the Claims

The Examiner has objected to Claims 1, 10 and 19 for lacking antecedent basis for "the message" and for the term "may" appearing in the Claims. The subject Claims have been amended to overcome the objections.

3. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 8, 10, 11, 17, 19-20 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh (U.S. 2002/0107924-A1). Applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 (and similarly independent Claims 10 and 19) recites:

"checking customization settings to determine whether or not to offer modification of the text of the e-mail

message to notify a recipient of a detected customization setting; and

in response to said checking detecting a particular customization setting, generating a user prompt to permit a user to automatically modify the text of said e-mail message."

First, Walsh is concerned with automatically attaching documents to an e-mail and not adding text to an e-mail to indicate that there is a customization to the e-mail (which may include that the e-mail has an attachment). The Examiner has cited pg. 3, paragraph 33 as containing support for a feature described as: "generating a user prompt to permit a user to automatically modify the email message" on page 4 of the above-referenced Office Action. However, as quoted above, the feature included in the independent claims is "generating a user prompt to permit a user to automatically modify the text of said e-mail message". The cited paragraph describes an association table that relates text that may be in a document with specific document identification, and does not describe modifying the text of an e-mail message at all. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to "include a prompt modification of the text of the message if an indication of [an] incomplete message is determined." Applicants respectfully disagree, because Walsh is concerned with a completely different methodology and system: one that automatically *customizes* an e-mail message based on the

e-mail message's text and not modifying the e-mail messages text at all.

The Examiner further states that modifying the text of an e-mail message is known in the art, and cites Tsai (U.S. 6,839,741) in support of the above contention. However, Tsai is concerned with yet another methodology, which consists of stripping attachments from e-mail and inserting text notifying the recipient that the attachment has been stripped. In the context of the present invention, Tsai discloses removing a customization and indicating to the e-mail recipient that the e-mail message has been automatically modified to remove the customization.

Nothing in Tsai or Tsai in combination with Walsh would suggest the methodology and system of the Claimed invention, which is to detect the presence of a customization and insert text indicating that the customization is present in the e-mail.

The Examiner has further rejected Claims 3-5, 12-14, and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Walsh in view of Chrabaszcz (U.S. 6,073,133). Applicant respectfully disagrees. For the reasons stated above, Walsh does not make obvious the claimed invention and neither does Chrabaszcz, which is concerned with determining when a user may intend to attach an attachment based on text included in the message and not

modifying the text of a message to indicate the presence of a customization. Therefore, applicants believe that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) have been overcome.


Therefore, for all of the reasons stated above, Applicant believes that all rejections and objections have been overcome and that the application is in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully submits that this Amendment, in view of the Remarks offered in conjunction therewith, are fully responsive to all aspects of the objections and rejections tendered by the Examiner in the Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits that he has persuasively demonstrated that the above-identified Patent Application, including Claims 1-27 is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited.

It is not believed that this Amendment letter requires any fee, but if there are any fees incurred by this Amendment Letter, please deduct them from our Deposit Account NO. 23-0830.

Respectfully submitted,


Andrew M. Harris
Reg. No. 42,638
(706)-782-9683

Weiss, Moy & Harris, P.C.
4204 North Brown Ave.
Scottsdale, AZ 85251